

### REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application is requested in view of the above amendments and the following remarks. Claims 6, 7, 13, 14 and 21-25 remain pending. New claims 24 and 25 are supported, for example, at page 7, lines 22-23.

US 5,393,616 (Mori), cited in the rejection of claims 15-23, was not listed on the PTO 892 form. Applicants respectfully request that a corrected 892 form be provided.

Applicants confirm the election of product claims 1-7 and 15-23. Applicants request that non-elected claims 13-14 be retained in the application for reinstatement and allowance with claims 6 and 7.

Claims 1-4, 6 and 7 have been rejected as anticipated by or obvious over Maeda. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. The rejection of claims 1-4 is moot in view of the cancellation of those claims. Applicants are not conceding the correctness of the rejection for claims 1-4.

The experimental data in the present specification shows that the product of claim 6 in fact is not anticipated or even suggested by Maeda. Example 3, which is directed to the preparation of compound 3 (page 10 of the specification), corresponds to claim 6. As can be seen in Table 1 on page 10 and Fig. 2, the product of claim 6 is characterized by high crystallinity, low conductivity and low solubility.

In contrast, Col. 4, lines 52-54 indicate that the product of the reference is an amorphous, high conductivity product. In this regard, note that the reference identifies conductivity in terms of  $\Omega\text{-cm}$ , while Table 1 of the present specification identifies conductivity in terms of  $\Omega\text{-cm}^{-1}$ . In the context of the reference higher numbers represent decreased conductivity. Thus the reference refers to values less than 15  $\Omega\text{-cm}$  as reflecting high conductivity. In the context of the present specification higher numbers represent increased conductivity. Converting the values of the reference to those used in the present specification, the maximum of 15  $\Omega\text{-cm}$  becomes a MINIMUM of 0.07  $\Omega\text{-cm}^{-1}$ , which is orders of magnitude higher than the conductivity of  $1 \times 10^{-5} \Omega\text{-cm}^{-1}$  reported for compound 3 in Table 1.

The disclosure of the Maeda itself demonstrates that there is no reasonable for assuming that the product of the reference would be similar to that of claim 6. The rejection of claims 6 and 7 should be withdrawn.

Claims 3-5 have been rejected as anticipated by or obvious over Katsumoto. This issue is rendered moot by the cancellation of claims 3-5. Applicants are not conceding the correctness of the rejection.


Claims 15-23 have been rejected as obvious over Maeda in view of Mori and Bernard. The rejection is rendered moot for canceled claims 15-20; Applicants are not conceding the correctness of the rejection for those claims. The rejection relies on Maeda for the feature of claim 6, to which claim 21 refers. Claims 22 and 23 depend from claim 21. Therefore, claims 21-23 are allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 6. Applicants are not conceding the rejection's interpretation of Mori and Bernard or the suitability of the references for combination.

Favorable reconsideration in the form of a Notice of Allowance is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

MERCHANT & GOULD  
P. O. Box 2903  
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-0903  
(612) 371-5265

Date: June 3, 2004

By:   
Douglas P. Mueller  
Reg. No. 30,300